

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 3:14CR096(1)

Plaintiff,

v.

District Judge Walter H. Rice
Magistrate Judge Michael J. Newman

SHELLIE WOODS,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION¹

This case came on for hearing on Tuesday, June 23, 2015. The United States was represented by Assistant United States Brent Tabacchi; Defendant was represented by Hal Arenstein. The case was referred to the undersigned under Fed. R. Crim. P. 59 for plea proceedings. Defendant, through counsel, orally consented to proceed before the United States Magistrate Judge for this hearing.

The undersigned examined Defendant under oath as to his understanding of the Plea Agreement and the effect of entering a plea pursuant to that Agreement. Having conducted that colloquy, the Magistrate Judge is persuaded that Defendant understands the rights waived by entering a guilty plea and is competent to do so. The Magistrate Judge also concludes that execution of the Plea Agreement, which was acknowledged in open court, is Defendant's knowing, intelligent and voluntary act. It is therefore respectfully recommended that the Plea Agreement be accepted.

¹ Attached hereto is a NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge concludes that Defendant's guilty plea to Counts One and Two of the Second Superseding Indictment dated January 13, 2015 is knowing, intelligent and voluntary, and that the Statement of Facts made a part of the Plea Agreement, whose truth Defendant acknowledged, provides a sufficient factual basis for a guilty finding. It is therefore respectfully recommended that Defendant's guilty plea be accepted, and Defendant be found guilty as charged in Counts One and Two of the Second Superseding Indictment.

Anticipating the District Court's adoption of this Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge referred Defendant for a pre-sentence investigation, and remanded him to the custody of the United States Marshal.

June 23, 2015

s/Michael J. Newman
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 59 (b)(2), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(e), this period is automatically extended to seventeen days because this Report is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B)(C), or (D) and may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation are based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F. 2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985).